

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are pending and are hereby amended. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19-21 are independent. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraph [0046]. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,313,298 to Meeker (hereinafter, merely “Meeker”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A method for encoding a moving video signal comprising a plurality of images, each image having a plurality of pixels, said method comprising steps of:

generating a sum signal and a difference signal of images for every two frames;

deciding an encoding bit rate for the sum signal and the difference signal based on the sum signal and the difference signal;

encoding the sum signal and the difference signal respectively based on the encoding bit rate; and

generating an output signal on the basis of a proportion of a data quantity generated by encoding the sum signal and a data quantity generated by encoding the difference signal.
(emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Meeker relates to providing a new video companding technique and more specifically, to provide video companding which uses spatial masking without introducing blurring into video images.

It is respectfully submitted that Meeker does not render claim 1 unpatentable. Page 2 of the Office Action cites figure 8, elements 118 and 130 of Meeker, which relate to a summer and subtractor respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Meeker does not disclose, “generating a sum signal and a difference signal of images for every two frames”. Applicants submit that there is no disclosure in Meeker of generating a sum signal and difference signal of images for every two frames.

Applicants further submit that Meeker does not disclose or suggest, “deciding an encoding bit rate for the sum signal and the difference signal based on the sum signal and the difference signal”. Page 2 of the Office Action cites column 18, lines 45-55 of Meeker which states, “data stream is supplied from the medium 197 to a data demultiplexer 198 which separates out the data values F corresponding to particular pixels from the offset. The offset is supplied from demultiplexer 198 to the summer 144 by way of a delay register 199. The register 199 has a delay in it to insure that the offset S_i , which is equal to the offset R_i , is supplied to the summer 144 at the same time that the signal portion H_i is supplied to that summer.” Applicants submit that Meeker provides no disclosure of deciding an encoding bit rate for the sum signal and the difference signal based on the sum signal and the difference signal.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Meeker fails to teach or suggest generating an output signal on the basis of a proportion of a data quantity generated by encoding the sum signal and a data quantity generated by encoding the difference signal, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 7, 13 and 19-21, which recites similar features, are also patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19-21 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800